



PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-04-26-020206

Town of Bluffton
Department of Growth Management
20 Bridge Street P.O. Box 386 Bluffton, South Carolina 29910
Telephone 843-706-4522
OLD TOWN

Plan Type: Historic District **Apply Date:** 04/08/2026
Plan Status: Hold **Plan Address:** 33 Guerrard Avenue
BLUFFTON, SC 29910
Case Manager: Charlotte Moore **Plan PIN #:** R610 039 00A 0425 0000
Plan Description: A request by Patrick Mason (Patrick Mason Custom Homes), on behalf of the owner, Webb Dean Developmen LLC, for review of a proposed 2300 SF Medium House Type and a detached 814 SF Carriage House at 33 Guerrard Street (Lot 1B) in the Old Town Bluffton Historic District and zoned Neighborhood General-HD. (STATUS 05.01.2026): Concept Plan has inconsistencies that the applicant has been requested to revise before HPRC review. Will reschedule HPRC meeting when revised Concept Plan is received. STATUS (07.01.2026): Concept Plan to be reviewed by HPRC on July 13, 2026.

Staff Review (HD)

Submission #: 1 Recieved: 04/08/2026 Completed:

Reviewing Dept.	Complete Date	Reviewer	Status
Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review		Matthew Michaels	Pending Review
Growth Management Dept Review (HD)		Angie Castrillon	Pending Review
HPRC Review		Charlotte Moore	Pending Review
HPRC Review	07/10/2026	Charlotte Moore	Denied

Comments:

1. Site Improvements: Show all horizontal and vertical improvements on the site plan. At a minimum, the site plan is missing a front walk, driveway and the service yards. It is unclear what other items they may be constructed that are not depicted on the site plan since these principal items are missing.
2. Plan Set Order: Order the plan set in the industry standard fashion: foundation, floor plans, elevations, building sections, detailed sections, electrical plans.
3. Driveway: Provide a driveway layout that will allow for foundation plantings along the side of the home to soften the transition between landscape and vertical construction.
4. Brackets: The diagonal bracket member is unclear and appears too skinny on the elevations.
5. Windows: All of the windows are out of scale with each other. Some window lites have exaggerated tall, skinny proportions, while others are very squat and square. They must be of a similar proportion (ratio) to give the overall design a sense of proportion. The left and rear elevations of the house rely too heavily on transom windows. Revisit these elevations to include windows to break up the facade and balance with the remainder of the architecture.
6. Chimney and Fireplace: The fireplace and chimney should rest on a foundation and not "float" by cantilevering from the house. Additionally, restudy the proportion of the bishop cap chimney with traditional applications.
7. Columns: Restudy the spacing of the front porch columns and first floor front windows to have some relationship to the main roof centerline and windows above. For the rear porch, ensure that column spacing complies with UDO 5.15.6.H.1.a., and show compliance with dimensions on the elevations.
8. Railing Detail: Update the railing detail to comply with 5.15.6.H.3.d: 2 3/4" minimum top rail.
9. Soffit: Hardie soffit is not an approved soffit material. Refer to carriage house wall section detail.
10. Hardie board Dimensions: 2x hardie board is not a real material even though it is called out throughout the plans. Hardie board only comes in 1x & 5/4x thicknesses. Indicate an alternative material where 2x hardie indicated on the plans. Indicate the width of all board as well (i.e. "2x8" not just "2x"). There are several instances of 1x as well. If a board needs to be cut to size, indicate as necessary (i.e. "1x4 cut to 3")
11. Foundation Vents: Vent sizing is inconsistent and vents lack alignment.
12. If all of the low pitch roofs at the porches have exposed rafters, so should the back porch.
13. The rear door says 6'-8" on the elevations and 8'-0" in the schedule, would prefer 8'-0" so it aligns with the window head.
14. Show a depiction of the main structure and carriage house together to see and compare the height difference.
15. The carriage house structure is too vertical; consider adding a bracketed roof over the garage door and man doors would help.
16. The left and right elevations of the carriage house are too broad and unarticulated.
17. The window on the right second floor elevation of the carriage house is too small and low. Consider adding a dormer as provided on the left side.
18. The carriage house dormer roof is too flat and should be a minimum of 4/12.
19. The carriage house attic louvers are too close to the roof as well as too short and fat.

Growth Management Dept Review
(HD)

Charlotte Moore

Denied

Comments:

1. The plan provided appears to be a near replication of the project at 8 Wharf Street (also the same owner).
2. Lot Coverage: The NG-HD district limits the maximum lot coverage to 60%. Lot coverage includes all impervious surfaces. While the application shows only 100 square feet of impervious surface, the site plan does not include the driveway, service areas for the main structure and carriage house, front and rear main structure stairs, and the required walkway from the front porch to the property line. Lot coverage includes areas that are not under roof, which may include gravel areas, such as driveways, if not designed per stormwater requirements (UDO Sec. 5.10).
3. Consistency of Information: Some information in the project analysis sheet does not match the plan set (e.g., gutters identified as to be installed but not shown on the elevations, shutters shown as "n/a" but will be provided on the carriage house, siding shown as "wood" on the analysis sheet but just "siding" on the main structure and "hardie-plank" on the carriage house, etc.). Revise for consistency.
4. Building Orientation: Per UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F.5.a., the front principal façade of all buildings must be built parallel to the street that it faces. The building orientation is slightly askew.
5. Service Yards: Show service yards and details in compliance with UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F.9.
6. Vehicle Access: Is the garage intended to have vehicle access? The proximity of the main structure and the stairs (not shown) are likely to impede access.
7. Windows and Doors: Show all window and door operations and label windows based on the proposed window and door schedule. The plan shows windows that do not appear on the elevation ("I" is a fixed-casement-fixed combination). Fixed windows are not a permitted window operation per UDO Sec. 5.15.6.I.3.b.
8. Plan Resubmission: The full requirements for the Concept Plan submission have not been met, including detailed narrative, photos, site plan, and architectural details as indicated on the COFA application. Given the lack of information and inconsistencies, a second Concept Plan submission and HPRC meeting will be required. At the time of resubmission, provide a plan set as one PDF to include the survey, site plan, and architectural plan set in the order indicated in the HPRC comments. The Power Point presentation provided to the applicant on March 26 includes links to pertinent UDO sections that the designer should reference to confirm compliance.

Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer
Review

07/10/2026

Matthew Michaels

Approved with Conditions

Comments:

Comments may be provided at time of Building Permit application.

Watershed Management Review 06/30/2026 Samantha Crotty Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. All development that exceeds 5,000 square feet of land disturbance, as well as all re-development that results in an additional 2,000 square feet of impervious surface will be required to meet SoLoCo standards. 2. All development/redevelopment that results in a cumulative impervious surface area of 5,000 square feet or greater must provide a grading/drainage plan at time of stormwater permit review. 3. Additional stormwater comments may be provided at time of building permit submittal.

Watershed Management Review 05/01/2026 Samantha Crotty Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. All development that exceeds 5,000 square feet of land disturbance, as well as all re-development that results in an additional 2,000 square feet of impervious surface will be required to meet SoLoCo standards.
2. All development/redevelopment that results in a cumulative impervious surface area of 5,000 square feet or greater must provide a grading/drainage plan at time of stormwater permit review.
3. Additional stormwater comments may be provided at time of building permit submittal.

Transportation Department
Review - HD 06/22/2026 Megan Andrews Approved

Comments:

No comments

~~Transportation Department~~
~~Review - HD~~ ~~04/13/2026~~ ~~Mark Maxwell~~ ~~Approved~~

~~**Comments:**~~~~No comments~~**Plan Review Case Notes:**